

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 19, 2007, has been received and reviewed. By the present Response and Amendment, Claim 3 is canceled, Claims 1, 4, 9, 11, and 16 are amended, and new Claim 21 is added. Currently pending in the application, then, are Claims 1-2 and 4-21, of which Claims 1, 9, 11, and 16 are independent. No new matter is introduced.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 has been objected to due to minor informalities. This claim has been amended to clarify that the underlying panel material sample extends beyond the free edges of the overlying panels. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,000,561 to Schumacher. Claims 11, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. Des. 249,000 to Simmons. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,000,561 to Schumacher. Claims 12, 13, 16, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Des. 249,000 to Simmons in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,391,796 to Cross. And Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Des. 249,000 to Simmons in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,391,796 to Cross, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 556,483 to Wayne.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with, but does not traverse, the Examiner's rejections. These claims are further addressed below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant has rewritten the claims to include the allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 is amended to include the elements of Claim 3, and Claim 3 is canceled. In addition, Claim 1 is amended to define the panels being wider, longer, or both wider and longer than the adjacent overlying panel, as shown in the embodiment of Figures 1, 4, and 5. Furthermore, Claim 1 is amended to define the material samples extending beyond the free edges of the overlying panels, as shown in all of the figures. These minor amendments are made to better define the elements of the invention that advantageously allow for viewing the underlying samples regardless of where the panel display is opened to, without reading on the cited references.

For these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-8, and 10 are dependent from Claim 1, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

New Claim 21 is dependent from Claim 1 and adds back in the specific language of allowable Claim 3 and its base Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the elements of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the elements of allowable Claim 3, and Claim 16 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the elements of allowable Claim 9. Accordingly, independent Claims 11 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 12-15 and 17-20 are dependent from Claims 11 and 16, respectively, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments submitted herein and the above comments, it is believed that all grounds of rejection are overcome and that the application has now been placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits early and favorable action. Should there be any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney at (770) 984-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

/John W. Greenwald/
John W. Greenwald
Reg. No. 41,805

Customer No. 23506
GARDNER GROFF SANTOS & GREENWALD, PC
Tel: (770) 984-2300
Fax: (770) 984-0098